



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/132,327 08/11/98 SAFARS

M USB97-SVN-DM

000466

TM02/0126

YOUNG & THOMPSON

745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON VA 22202

EXAMINER

PAUL A. C.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED:

01/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/132,327

Applicant(s)

SAFARS ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/25/00.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-33 have been canceled. Claims 34-60 are pending in the case. Claim 34 is an independent claim.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # PCT/FR98/00917 filed in France on 5/6/1998, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to **a single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise **and should not repeat information given in the title.** It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

7. Claims 34-35, 41-43, 47-48, and 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kessenich et al (Pat. # 6,034,680, 3/7/2000, filed on 4/30/1997).

Regarding independent claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *displaying electronic documents from a plurality of data sources*—(Fig. 3). Kessenich et al teach a method for displaying and organizing books into categories and placing a central address or universal location for the accessing of these books.

Moreover, Kessenich et al disclose: *generating a set of electronic books arranged for referencing and displaying the electronic documents*—“A common internet web access address 16 is supplied together with each one of the plurality of different printed books” (col. 5, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 1-67). Kessenich et al teach a method for displaying and organizing books into categories in a library and placing a central address or universal location for the accessing of these books.

Moreover, Kessenich et al disclose: *consulting and altering the structure of said electronic book*—“Further screens or pages of the child and young adult path are shown in FIGS. 4 and 5” (col. 7, lines 18-67). Kessenich et al teach a method for access, and altering and displaying books while moving from through further screen displays in an electronic library.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose:

implementation of a set of electronic books for management by the workstation and put in the library—"supplying supplementary information related to printed books....."(col. 26, lines 26-67, col. 4, lines 1-67). Kessenich et al teach a method for managing updating and consulting electronic books in an electronic library.

Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *inserting, supressing or consulting electronic documents*--"manipulating images on a graphical user interface" (Col. 8, lines 4-22). Kessenich et al teach the manipulation of images of an electronic library on a computer screen.

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *provide a visual display mode in the form of a media library to provide access to the information*--"With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case" (Col. 7, lines 45-56), and "selection box 72 provides a hyper link to a further web page of hyper links to museums" (Col. 8, lines 4-22). Kessenich et al teach a visual display of a library to guide the user in the process of using the books and accessing different databases.

Regarding claim 43, which depends on claim 7, Kessenich et al disclose: *provide a visual display mode in the form of a lectern intended for storage of the current data*-- "visual representation 69 of each page an illustration of BOOK 2" (Col. 7, lines 58-67). Kessenich et al teach a mode for the display of information in the form of a virtual book about certain topic.

Regarding claim 47, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *previewing of the documents to be consulted in the form of a book*--"With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case" (Col. 7, lines 45-56).

Art Unit: 2176

Kessenich et al teach a visual display of a library to guide the user in the process of using or previewing the books in that library.

Regarding claim 48, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *steps for access by document type including identification location*-- “A mouse click, or the like on the Adults box 54....initiates a display on the same web page” (Col. 7, lines 15-20). Kessenich et al teach a mode for the location, and display of information in the form of a virtual book about certain topic.

Regarding claim 51, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *provide automatic positioning of a page marker*-- “A common internet web access address 16 is supplied together with each one of the plurality of different printed books ...in the form of a bookmark” (Col. 5, lines 57-61). Kessenich et al teach a common internet address, which the user can use to return to previously accessed books.

Regarding claim 52, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *a mechanism for consultation of a file system, based on the metaphor of a book* --“With reference to FIG. 3.....virtual Dewey Decimal indexing system....to look for books on other topics” (Col. 7, lines 45-67). Kessenich et al teach a mode for the search, location, and display of information in the form of a virtual book about certain topic.

Regarding claim 53, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *provide a visual display mode in the form of a page intended for consultation in the form of data vignettes* -
- “displaying a special log on screen.....which provides an optional opportunity to provide such personal information as name, age.....to tailor the hyperlinks of the child and young adult path”

Art Unit: 2176

(Col. 8, lines 46-67). Kessenich et al a mode for the display of information in the form of a virtual page about certain topic.

Regarding claim 54, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: *allow searching for items of information which are segmented by level--* “there are two possible selections: a Children and Young Adults selection box 56 and an Adults selection box” (Col. 7, lines 11-20). Kessenich et al teach in the above quote, the searching for information based on a specific topic such as children’s information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 37-39, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al.

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 35 rejected under 35 USC 102 (e), above, Kessenich et al disclose: “displaying a special log on screen.....which provides an optional opportunity to provide such personal information as name, age.....to tailor the hyperlinks of the child and young adult path” (Col. 8, lines 46-67, col. 7, lines 45-67, and col. 8, lines 1-67). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *subscription for receiving electronic documents from dedicated sources--* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform this step, because Kessenich et al teach in the above

Art Unit: 2176

quote, the customizing of electronic books in a library to receive books and data according to user's preferences.

Regarding claim 38, which depends on claim 35, Kessenich et al disclose: "displaying a special log on screen.....which provides an optional opportunity to provide such personal information as name, age.....to tailor the hyperlinks of the child and young adult path" (Col. 8, lines 46-67). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *set of management electronic books further comprises an electronic book of preferences* -- However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to performed this step, because Kessenich et al teach in the above quote, the customizing or setting the preferences of electronic books in a library.

Regarding claim 39, which depends on claim 35, Kessenich et al disclose: "A selection box 78 can provide a hyperlink to a further web page of activities.....one or more book synopses and /or literary reviews" (Col. 8, lines 30-67). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *set of management electronic books further comprises an electronic book for help*-- However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to performed this step, because Kessenich et al teach the accessing book synopses to aid the user to browse an electronic library.

Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 42, Kessenich et al disclose: "an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated" (Col. 7, lines 46-67, and Fig. 3). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a mode of miniature visual display of the books placed on the lectern* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2176

invention to performed this step, because Kessenich et al teach: "visual representation 69 of each page an illustration of BOOK 2" (Col. 7, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "A selection box 78 can provide a hyperlink to a further web page of activities.one or more book synopses and /or literary reviews" (Col. 8, lines 30-67). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a visual display mode in the form of a notebook intended for consultation--* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed this step, because Kessenich et al teach in the above quote, the consulting book synopses to aid the user in an electronic library.

10. Claims 46, 55, and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 34, in view of Dockter et al (Pat. # 5,870,737, 2/9/1999, filed on 4/15/1996).

Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case" (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *...visual display mode in the form of a sorter.* Dockter et al disclose: ".....the user places the cursor over the thumbs-up iconpage construction procedure 32 rearranges the listings and places....." (Col. 4, lines 40-47). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to performed this step, because Dockter et al disclose: ".....providing a screen which displays a response that is influenced by prior expressed preferences" (Col. 2, lines 40-54).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 55, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "supplying a common internet web access address together with each one of the plurality of different printed books" (Col. 3, lines 30-40). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *incremental generation of books and long-lived data from electronic data.....* Dockter et al disclose: "page construction procedure 32 accesses a page template ...and includes an initial list of children's books " (Col. 4, lines 24-47). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Dockter et al, because Dockter et al disclose: "providing a screen which displays a response that is influenced by prior expressed preferences" (Col. 2, lines 40-54).

Regarding claim 59, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case" (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *provide visual identification of the freshness of an item of information consulted and/or stored.* Dockter et al disclose: "the user places the cursor over the thumbs-up iconpage construction procedure 32 rearranges the listings and places" (Col. 4, lines 40-47). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Dockter et al, because Dockter et al disclose: "providing a screen which displays a response that is influenced by prior expressed preferences" (Col. 2, lines 40-54).

Regarding claim 60, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "supplying a common internet web access address together with each one of the plurality of different printed books" (Col. 3, lines 30-40). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *generate one or more*

Art Unit: 2176

temporary icons for loading of electronic data. Dockter et al disclose: “page construction procedure 32 accesses a page template ...and includes an initial list of children’s books ” (Col. 4, lines 24-47). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Dockter et al, because Dockter et al disclose: “providing a screen which displays a response that is influenced by prior expressed preferences” (Col. 2, lines 40-54).

11. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of Randall (Pat. # 5,237,651, 8/17/1993, filed on 12/20/1991)

Regarding claim 56, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: “With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case” (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *provide a sheet or a loose-leaf divider making it possible to keep information on the screen.....* Randall discloses: “...personal organisor.....loose-leaf booklet arranged into various sections....memory means” (Col. 4, lines 16-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Randall, because Randall discloses: “allow selection of a required operational mode in dependence on the representational graphics displayed ” (Col. 3, lines 37-57).

12. Claims 36, 40, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of WordPerfect 6.1 screendumps (4/15/1996).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 35, Kessenich et al disclose: *a catalog including keywords--*“With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case ...enter a virtual Dewey Decimal indexing

Art Unit: 2176

system...” (Col. 7, lines 45-67). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a thesaurus*.

WordPerfect screendumps teach providing a thesaurus—(Fig. 3, p.1). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and WordPerfect 6.1 screendumps, because WordPerfect screendumps teach above allowing a user to display the synonyms of words.

Regarding claim 40, which depends on claim 35, Kessenich et al disclose: “A selection box 78 can provide a hyperlink to a further web page of activities.....one or more book synopses and /or literary reviews.....” (Col. 8, lines 30-67, col. 6, lines). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book arranged for providing with the functionalities of an electronic mail software*. WordPerfect screendumps teach emailing documents to other users—(p.2). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and WordPerfect 6.1 screendumps, because WordPerfect screendumps teach above allowing a user to convey a document to other users who have an interest in such information.

Regarding claim 49, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: “With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case” (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *provide identification of the alterable or non-alterable status of the book via the appearance of its binding*. WordPerfect screendumps teach the indication of whether or not a document is read-only— whether a user could or could not edit the document—(Fig. 1, and 2). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and WordPerfect 6.1 screendumps, because

Art Unit: 2176

WordPerfect screendumps teach notifying a user of the editable status of the document in question.

13. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of O'Donoghue (Pat. # 5,867,811, 2/2/1999, filed on 2/16/1995)

Regarding claim 50, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case " (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *provide double page reading based on a page translation*. O'Donoghue discloses: "generate corresponding aligned pair of corpora, shown at 206 in FIG. 2" (Col. 3, lines 62-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and O'Donoghue's side-by-side translation, because O'Donoghue discloses: "generation of high quality aligned corpora can be performed quickly by relatively inexpensive processing equipment" (Col. 2, lines 62-67).

14. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of Darnell et al (Pat. # 5,596,700, 1/21/1997, filed on 2/17/1993).

Regarding claim 57, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: "With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case " (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *provide annotation of electronic mail*. Darnell et al teach: "creating annotation (notes) from text entered by a user. The notes are permanently and persistently associated with the title text in a window " (Col. 3 lines 12-50). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Darnell notes,

Art Unit: 2176

because Darnell et al is teaching above, the persistent association of notes with a document—a book.

15. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessenich et al, as applied to claim 1, in view of Vertelney et al (Pat. # 5,341,293, 8/23/1994, filed on 9/3/1992)

Regarding claim 58, which depends on claim 34, Kessenich et al disclose: “With reference to FIG. 3,an image 64 of a set of books can be illustrated, the latter for example as a book case” (Col. 7, lines 45-57). Kessenich et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a multi-mode icon*. Vertelney et al disclose: “After the document has been sent, the element instance could again be modified to indicate that the document has been sent ...indicate other functions or operations of the element ” (Col. 10, lines 2-15). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Kessenich et al and Vertelney et al, because Vertelney et al disclose: “interface elements for marking, finding, organizing, and processing data ” (Col. 3, lines 54-67).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicants are directed to the rejections based on the newly added claims.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2176

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

- (703) 308-5403, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,


Application/Control Number: 09/132,327

Art Unit: 2176

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

01/17/01


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100